

### REMARKS

Prior to the Final Action, claims 4-18 were pending in the application. The Examiner declined to consider claims 9-14 on the ground that it would require an additional search and rejected the remaining claims as anticipated by Segars et al. or obvious over Segars et al. in view of Folwell et al.

With this amendment, new claims 19-35 are presented and a Request for Continued Examination with the required fee is being filed herewith. Claims 19, 25, and 31 are independent. Claims 19-23 correspond generally to previous claims 4-8. Claim 24 corresponds to previous claim 9 but is dependent on claim 19. Claims 25-29 correspond to previous claims 9-14, and claims 31-34 correspond to previous claims 15-18. Claim 35 corresponds to previous claim 9 but is dependent on claim 31.

The Examiner previously rejected claim 4 as anticipated by Segars et al. It was pointed out to the Examiner that Segars et al. does not provide information about substantially every instruction executed by the processor. Segars et al. only discloses providing information about breakpoint instructions to selected exception routines.

The Examiner replied that the claim language "substantially every instruction" made the claim broad enough to read on Segars et al. During a subsequent telephone conversation with the Examiner, it was proposed to amend the claim to specify that the instructions include instructions other than breakpoint instructions. The Examiner agreed that this would overcome the rejection but that it would require a new search. Thus, this amendment is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination. New claim 19 includes the limitation that the instructions on which information is provided include instructions other than breakpoint instructions. This puts the claim beyond Segars et al. and the other art of record.

Claims 20-24 depend from claim 19 and thus are allowable for the same reasons.

Claim 25 claims another aspect of the invention, i.e. the use of two clocks. This feature was not examined in the parent application. It is believed that claiming this feature now both in independent and dependent form at this stage of prosecution requires a proper examination of this feature.

Claims 26-30 depend from claim 25.

With regard to claim 31, Segars et al. does not teach or suggest a debugging method where the processor provides information about processor activity and the debugger associates this information with instructions as claimed in claim 31. In Segars et al. the debugger merely sets a breakpoint register and an exception routine field.

In the Final Action, the Examiner stated that Segars et al. taught the first clause of claim 15 (now claim 31) and cited column and lines in Segars et al. The Examiner also claimed that Segars et al. taught the second clause of claim 15 (now claim 31) but he did not cite any portion of Segars et al. to support this claim. It is respectfully submitted that the second clause of claim 15 (now claim 31) is not taught or suggested by Segars et al.

Claims 32-35 depend from claim 31.

Thus, none of the claims is anticipated or rendered obvious by Segars et al.

Folwell et al. discloses a branch decision encoding scheme. Folwell et al. does not supply the teachings missing from Segars et al. and described above. Thus, none of the independent claims

is anticipated or rendered obvious by Folwell et al. taken alone or in combination with Segars et al.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "David P. Gordon".

David P. Gordon  
Reg. #29,996  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

65 Woods End Road  
Stamford, CT 06905  
(203) 329-1160

March 27, 2003